

### **REMARKS**

The enclosed is responsive to Examiner's Office Action mailed on October 12, 2006. At the time Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-19, 22 and 24-27 were pending. By way of the present response Applicant has: 1) amended claims 1, 22, 24 and 27; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled claim 8. As such, claims 1-7, 9-19, 22 and 24-27 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented. No new matter has been added.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

Claims 1, 22, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As a result, Applicant has amended claim 1, 22, 24 and 27 in order to comply with the requirement. Applicant submits that the claims as amended now overcome the rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim rejections. Specifically, Applicant has removed the requirement that each of "the plurality of IM sessions" be limited to a different contact than the other contacts of the other IM sessions.

Additionally, Applicant submits that the amendments are non-narrowing because each of the "plurality of IM sessions" are not limited to a different contact. The claims as amended now allow for there to be one or more IM

sessions for each contact (which is actually an expansion of the claims as filed).

Finally, Applicant submits that the amendment adds no new matter to the application. Applicant supports this by pointing to the specification at [0019] and to the Office Action. [Office Action, Oct. 12, 2006, p. 4 (“[t]he above section of the specification cites that ‘Each of the indicators 310, 312, 314, 316 corresponds to a different IM session’, but each of said different IM sessions is not necessary [sic] with a different contact than the contacts of the other IM sessions as recited in the claim because each of said different IM session could be the same contact or participant with the other contacts of the other IM sessions.”)].

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-17, 22, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0130904 (hereinafter “Becker”) in view of Widger et al, U.S. Publication No. 2005/0117733 (hereinafter “Widger”). Applicant does not admit that Widger and Becker are prior art and reserves the right to swear behind either at a later time.

### Independent Claims 1, 22, 24 and 27

With respect to independent claims 1, 22, 24 and 27 applicant has amended the claims to further distinguish the prior art references cited by the Office Action. Claim 1, as amended, currently recites the following:

1. A method of displaying a plurality of concurrent IM sessions:

providing a graphical interface to display information related to a plurality of IM sessions, wherein each IM session in the plurality of IM sessions is with a different ~~contact than the contacts of session than the sessions of~~ the other IM sessions in the plurality of IM sessions;

displaying a first one of the plurality of IM sessions in a single IM session window;

representing each one of the plurality of IM sessions as a corresponding one of a plurality of indicators in the single IM session window;

receiving a plurality of messages in one or more of the plurality of IM sessions; and

indicating the number of messages received in ~~one or more of the~~ plurality of IM sessions in the respective indicators in the single IM session window which corresponds to the one or more of the plurality of IM sessions in response to receiving the plurality of messages, and

upon reaching a number of messages equal to a specified threshold, displaying a second symbol to indicate that the number of messages are above the threshold.

Claims 22, 24 and 27 have been similarly amended. Applicant submits that this amendment now puts the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant supports this by pointing to the Office Action which has allowed claim 8 if it were written in independent form. [Office Action, pp. 15-16]. Applicant has incorporated the limitation of claim 8 which requires displaying a symbol to indicate that the number of messages received exceeds a threshold amount. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim rejections.

### Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-19 and 25-26

Because claims 2-7, are dependent on at least one of independent claims 1, 22, 24 and/or 27, either directly or indirectly, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 22, 24 and 27. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim rejections.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Widger and further in view of Vaananen, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0014456. Arguments with respect to claims 12 and 13 are now moot based on the above discussed amendments to claim 1 upon which claims 12 and 13 depend.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Widger and further in view of Helfman et al; U.S. Patent No. 6,396,513 (hereinafter "Helfman"). Arguments with respect to claims 18 and 19 are now moot based on the above discussed amendments to claim 1 upon which claims 12 and 13 depend.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact Matthew W. Hindman at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 2-9-2007



Matthew W. Hindman  
Reg. No.: 57, 396

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300